

Any other such applicant and any person who is presently registered with DEA to manufacture such substances may file comments or objections to the issuance of the above application.

Any such comments or objections may be addressed to the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, United States Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20537, Attention: DEA Federal Register Representative (CCR), and must be filed no later than December 26, 1995.

Dated: October 19, 1995.

Gene R. Haislip,

*Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration.*

[FR Doc. 95-26447 Filed 10-24-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-M

### **Manufacturer of Controller Substances; Notice of Application**

Pursuant to Section 1301.43(a) of Title 21 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), this is notice that on September 20, 1995, Nycomed Inc., 33 Riverside Avenue, Rensselaer, New York 12144, made a written request to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) for registration as a bulk manufacturer of the Schedule II controlled substance Meperidine (9230).

The firm plans to manufacture bulk product for distribution to its customers.

Any other such applicant and any person who is presently registered with DEA to manufacture such substances may file comments or objections to the issuance of the above application.

Any such comments or objections may be addressed to the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, United States Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20537, Attention: DEA Federal Register Representative (CCR), and must be filed no later than December 26, 1995.

Dated: October 19, 1995.

Gene R. Haislip,

*Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration.*

[FR Doc. 95-26448 Filed 10-24-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-M

### **Federal Bureau of Investigation**

#### **Criminal Justice Information Service (CJIS) Advisory Policy Board**

The Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) Advisory Policy Board will meet on December 6-7, 1995, from

9 a.m. until 5 p.m., at the Savannah Marriott Riverfront Hotel, 100 General McIntosh Boulevard, Savannah, Georgia, telephone 912-233-7722, to formulate recommendations to the Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) on the security, policy, and operation of the National Crime Information Center (NCIC), NCIC 2000, the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System (IAFIS), and the Uniform Crime Report (UCR) and National Incident Based Reporting System (NIBRS) programs.

The topics to be discussed will include the progress of the NCIC 2000 and IAFIS projects, status of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act, and other topics related to the management of the FBI's criminal history information systems.

The meeting will be open to the public on a first-come, first-seated basis. Any member of the public may file a written statement concerning the FBI CJIS Division programs or related matters with the Board, before or after. Anyone wishing to address this session of the meeting should notify the Designated Federal Employee, at least 24 hours prior to the start of the session. The notification may be by mail, telegram, cable, facsimiles, or a hand-delivered note. It should contain the requestor's name; corporate designation, consumer affiliation, or Government designation; along with a short statement describing the topic to be addressed; and the time needed for presentation. A nonmember requestor will ordinarily be allowed not more than 15 minutes to present a topic, unless specifically approved by the Chairman of the Board.

Inquires may be addressed to the Designated Federal Employee, Mr. Demery R. Bishop, Section Chief, Programs Development Section, CJIS Division, FBI, 10th and Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest, Washington, DC 20535, telephone 202-324-5084, facsimile 202-324-8906.

Dated: October 17, 1995.

Demery R. Bishop,

*Section Chief, Programs Development Section, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Designated Federal Employee.*

[FR Doc. 95-26375 Filed 10-24-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-02-M

### **NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION**

#### **Notice of Permits Issued Under the Antarctic Conservation Act of 1978**

**AGENCY:** National Science Foundation.

**ACTION:** Notice of permits issued under the Antarctic Conservation of 1978, Public Law 95-541.

**SUMMARY:** The National Science Foundation (NSF) is required to publish notice of permits issued under the Antarctic Conservation Act of 1978. This is the required notice.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Nadene G. Kennedy, Permit Office, Office of Polar Programs, Rm. 755, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On September 11, 1995, the National Science Foundation published a notice in the Federal Register of permit applications received.

Permits were issued on October 16, 1995 to the following applicants:

Colin Harris, Permit #96-013  
William R. Fraser, Permits #96-021, #96-022, and #96-023

Nadene G. Kennedy,

*Permit Office.*

[FR Doc. 95-26374 Filed 10-24-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

### **Special Emphasis Panel in Physics; Notice of Meeting**

In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463, as amended), the National Science Foundation announces the following meeting.

*Name:* Special Emphasis Panel in Physics (1208).

*Date and Time:* November 8, thru November 11, 1995, 8:00 a.m.-6:00 p.m.

*Place:* Room 1120, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA 22230.

*Type of Meeting:* Closed.

*Contact Person:* Dr. Marvin Goldberg, Program Director for Elementary Particle Physics, Division of Physics, Room 1015, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA 22230. Telephone: (703) 306-1894.

*Purpose of Meeting:* To provide advice and recommendations concerning proposals submitted to NSF for financial support.

*Agenda:* To review and evaluate Elementary Particle Physics Career proposals as part of the selection process for awards.

*Reason for Closing:* The proposals being reviewed include information of a proprietary or confidential nature, including technical information; financial data, such as salaries; and personal information concerning individuals associated with the proposals. These matters are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552b(c), (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: October 20, 1995.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

*Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 95-26486 Filed 10-24-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

**NUCLEAR REGULATORY  
COMMISSION****[Docket No. 50-366]****Georgia Power Company, et al.; Edwin  
I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit 2;  
Environmental Assessment and  
Finding of No Significant Impact**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering the issuance of an exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, to Facility Operating License No. NPF-5, issued to Georgia Power Company, et al. (GPC or the licensee), for operation of the Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit 2, located in Appling County, Georgia.

**Environmental Assessment*****Identification of the Proposed Action***

The proposed action would grant an exemption from 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Sections III.A.5(b)(1), III.A.5(b)(2), III.B.3, III.C.2(a), and III.C.3, for the Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit 2, in conjunction with License Amendment No. 132 issued March 17, 1994, which permitted an increase in the allowable main steam isolation valve (MSIV) leak rate from 11.5 standard cubic feet per hour (scfh) for any one MSIV to 100 scfh for any one MSIV, with a total maximum leak rate of 250 scfh through all four steam lines and the deletion of the leakage control system (LCS).

Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50, Sections II.H.4 and III.C.2 require leak rate testing of the MSIVs at the calculated peak containment pressure related to the design-basis accident, and Section III.A.5, III.B.3 and III.C.3 requires that the measured MSIV leak rates be included in the combined leak rate test results. The proposed exemption allows the exclusion of the measured MSIV leakage from the combined test results. The increase of the MSIV leak rate does not affect a previously approved exemption, stated in the Technical Specifications (TS), which allows the MSIV leak rate testing at a reduced pressure.

The proposed action for the exemption regarding leakage is in accordance with the licensee's letter dated June 20, 1995. The proposed action for the exemption from testing at accident pressure is based on the Commission's own initiative to account for a previously granted exemption as stated in the Hatch Unit 2 TS.

***The Need for the Proposed Action***

The exemption from the leakage acceptance criteria of 10 CFR Part 50,

Appendix J, is needed because the MSIV leakage rate is accounted for separately in the radiological site analysis. The exemption from the pressure requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, is needed because the design of the MSIVs is such that the test pressure is applied between two MSIVs in the same line and testing in the reverse direction for one of the MSIVs tends to unseat the valve disc and would result in a meaningless test.

***Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action***

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action related to the granting of an exemption from 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Sections III.A.5(b)(1), III.A.5(b)(2), III.B.3, and III.C.3, proposed by the licensee, and concludes that the proposed actions will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The proposed action for the exemption from testing at accident pressure, as required by Section III.C.2 of Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50, is based on the Commission's own initiative to account for a previously granted exemption as stated in the Hatch Unit 2 TS, and the Commission concludes that the action will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

The MSIV leakage, along with the containment leakage is used to calculate the maximum radiological consequences of a design-basis accident. Section 15.1.39 of the Hatch Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) indicates that standard and conservative assumptions have been used to calculate the offsite and control room doses, including the doses due to MSIV leakage, which could potentially result from a postulated loss-of-coolant accident (LOCA). Further, the technical support center, control room, and offsite doses resulting from a postulated LOCA have recently been recalculated using currently accepted assumptions and methods. The doses at the site boundary and the doses that could be received by personnel in the technical support center and control room due to MSIV leakage were calculated independently of all other types of containment leakage. These analyses have

demonstrated that the total leakage rate of 250 scfh results in dose exposures for the control room and offsite that remain within the limits of Appendix A to 10 CFR Part 100, as discussed in License Amendment No. 132.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed actions involve features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. They do not affect nonradiological plant effluents and have no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed actions.

***Alternatives to the Proposed Action***

Since the Commission has concluded there is no significant environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed actions. Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are similar.

***Alternative Use of Resources***

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the Hatch Nuclear Plant.

***Agencies and Persons Consulted***

In accordance with its stated policy, on September 28, 1995, the staff consulted with the Georgia State official, James L. Setser of the Department of Natural Resources, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

***Finding of No Significant Impact***

Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed actions will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed actions.

For further details with respect to the proposed actions, see the licensee's letter dated June 20, 1995, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Appling County Public Library, 301 City Hall Drive, Baxley, Georgia.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 19th day of October 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Victor Nerses,

*Acting Director, Project Directorate II-2,  
Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of  
Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 95-26422 Filed 10-24-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket Nos. 50-280 and 50-281]

**Virginia Electric and Power Company;  
Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2  
Environmental Assessment and  
Finding of No Significant Impact**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from certain requirements of its regulations to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-32 and DPR-37, issued to Virginia Electric and Power Company, (the licensee), for operation of the Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2 located in Surry County, Virginia.

**Environmental Assessment**

**Identification of Proposed Action**

The proposed action would grant an exemption from certain requirements of 10 CFR 50.60, "Acceptance Criteria for Fracture Prevention Measures for Light-Water Nuclear Power Reactors for Normal Operation," to allow application of an alternate methodology to determine the low temperature overpressure protection (LTOP) setpoint for the Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2. The proposed alternate methodology is consistent with guidelines developed by the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Working Group on Operating Plant Criteria (WGOPC) to define pressure limits during LTOP events that avoid certain unnecessary operational restrictions, provide adequate margins against failure of the reactor pressure vessel, and reduce the potential for unnecessary activation of pressure-relieving devices used for LTOP. These guidelines have been incorporated into Code Case N-514, "Low Temperature Overpressure Protection," which has been approved by the ASME Code Committee. The content of this code case has been incorporated into Appendix G of Section XI of the ASME Code and published in the 1993 Addenda to Section XI.

The philosophy used to develop Code Case N-514 guidelines is to ensure that the LTOP limits are still below the pressure/temperature (P/T) limits for normal operation, but allow the pressure that may occur with activation

of pressure-relieving devices to exceed the P/T limits, provided acceptable margins are maintained during these events. This philosophy protects the pressure vessel from LTOP events, and still maintains the Technical Specification P/T limits applicable for normal heatup and cooldown in accordance with Appendix G to 10 CFR Part 50 and Sections III and XI of the ASME Code.

**The Need for the Proposed Action**

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.60, all light-water nuclear power reactors must meet the fracture toughness and material surveillance program requirements for the reactor coolant pressure boundary as set forth in Appendices G and H to 10 CFR Part 50. Appendix G to 10 CFR Part 50 defines P/T limits during any condition of normal operation, including anticipated operational occurrences and system hydrostatic tests, to which the pressure boundary may be subjected over its service lifetime. It is specified in 10 CFR 50.60(b) that alternatives to the described requirements in Appendices G and H to 10 CFR Part 50 may be used when an exemption is granted by the Commission under 10 CFR 50.12.

To prevent transients that would produce pressure excursions exceeding the Appendix G P/T limits while the reactor is operating at low temperatures, the licensee installed an LTOP system. The LTOP system includes pressure relieving devices in the form of Power-Operated Relief Valves (PORVs) that are set at a pressure low enough that if a transient occurred while the coolant temperature is below the LTOP enabling temperature, they would prevent the pressure in the reactor vessel from exceeding the Appendix G P/T limits. To prevent these valves from lifting as a result of normal operating pressure surges (e.g., reactor coolant pump starting, and shifting operating charging pumps) with the reactor coolant system in a water solid condition, the operating pressure must be maintained below the PORV setpoint.

The reactor coolant system pressure/temperature operating window at low temperatures is defined by the LTOP setpoint. Minimal operating margin is available between the LTOP setpoint and the pressure experienced at low temperatures due to the startup of a reactor coolant pump, or as a result of normal operating pressure surges with the reactor coolant system in a water solid condition. Implementation of a LTOP setpoint that is valid from 15 EFY to the end-of-license without the additional margin allowed by ASME Code Case N-514 would restrict the

pressure/temperature operating window and would potentially result in undesired PORV lifts. Therefore, the licensee proposed that in determining the PORV setpoint for LTOP events for Surry, the allowable pressure be determined using the safety margins developed in an alternate methodology in lieu of the safety margins required by Appendix G to 10 CFR Part 50. The alternate methodology is consistent with ASME Code Case N-514. The content of this code case has been incorporated into Appendix G of Section XI of the ASME Code and published in the 1993 Addenda to Section XI.

An exemption from 10 CFR 50.60 is required to use the alternate methodology for calculating the maximum allowable pressure for LTOP considerations. By application dated June 8, 1995, the licensee requested an exemption from 10 CFR 50.60.

**Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action**

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action.

Appendix G of the ASME Code requires that the P/T limits be calculated: (a) using a safety factor of 2 on the principal membrane (pressure) stresses, (b) assuming a flaw at the surface with a depth of one-quarter (1/4) of the vessel wall thickness and a length of six (6) times its depth, and (c) using a conservative fracture toughness curve that is based on the lower bound of static, dynamic, and crack arrest fracture toughness tests on material similar to the Surry reactor vessel material.

In determining the PORV setpoint for LTOP events, the licensee proposed to use safety margins based on an alternate methodology consistent with the proposed ASME Code Case N-514 guidelines. The ASME Code Case N-514 allows determination of the setpoint for LTOP events such that the maximum pressure in the vessel would not exceed 110% of the P/T limits of the existing ASME Appendix G.

The change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed change involves use of a lower safety margin on fracture toughness for